

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 11, 15, 17, 21, 23 and 24 are currently amended. Claims 10, 18 and 22 have been canceled. New claims 25-27 have been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 was objected to because "light omitting diode" should have read "light emitting diode." Applicants have corrected that informality.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,797 (Yamanaka). Applicants have amended claim 1 and respectfully request reconsideration of those rejections.

The Office Action asserts that page 4, lines 4-8 of the present application amount to an admission by the Applicants that elongating a display electrode 19 so as to extend above a channel 13c of a thin film transistor is prior art. That is incorrect. Applicants request that the Examiner compare FIG. 9 (which is admitted prior art) with FIG. 2 (which is new). In FIG. 9 (which is admitted prior art), the display electrode 19 clearly is not extended above channel 13c. In FIG. 2 (which is new), the display electrode 19 is extended above channel 13c. Indeed, that is the most significant difference (if not the only difference) between those figures. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that elongating a display electrode 19 so as to extend above a channel 13c of a thin film transistor is not admitted prior art.

Also, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate subject matter previously recited in claim 10, which has been canceled. Claim 1 now recites that the elongated display electrode above the thin film transistor is reflective. Applicant's admitted prior art (as shown in FIG. 9) does not disclose that feature for at least the reasons discussed above. Nor does the Yamanaka

patent disclose that feature. In particular, the pixel electrode 10, shown in FIG. 13 of the Yamanaka patent is not reflective. Nor do any of the other layers above the liquid semiconductor device 1 of FIG. 13 amount to a reflective electrode. That is evident from FIG. 13 itself, which shows incident light passing through each layer of the liquid crystal driving device 11 and to a reflective surface that is located below the semiconductor device 1.

Applicants emphasize that certain implementations of the features now recited in claim 1 result in display devices that can create images with improved brightness.

Claim 1 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11-13 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 21 and 23 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Yamanaka patent. Claim 21 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Therefore, claim 21 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claim 23 depends from claim 21 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 2-4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,702,963 (Vu et al.).

Claim 2 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Claim 2 now recites that a display electrode that extends above a channel of the thin film transistor is reflective. As discussed above, Applicant's admitted prior art (FIG. 9) does not disclose that feature.

The Vu et al. patent also fails to disclose that feature. Instead, the Vu et al. patent merely discloses a dual gate metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) having first and second gates G1 and G2 that are connected to each other by a conductor. (See FIG. 15G) No mention is made of a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, certain implementations of those features can result in a display device being able to create images having improved brightness.

Claims 3, 4 and 15 depend from claim 2 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

Claims 17-19 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,702,963 (Vu et al.).

Claim 17 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 2. Therefore, claim 17 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with reference to claim 2.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Yamanaka patent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,954 (Kim et al.).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, neither Applicant's admitted prior art (FIG. 9), nor the Yamanaka patent discloses nor suggests that feature.

The Kim et al. patent also fails to disclose or suggest that feature. The Kim et al. patent merely discloses a liquid crystal display device that includes a planarizing organic gate insulator

and an organic planarizing layer. The Kim et al. patent does not even mention recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor.

Claim 7 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Yamanaka patent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,066 (Tang et al.).

Claim 14 depends from claim 1, which recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, neither Applicant's admitted prior art (FIG. 9), nor the Yamanaka patent discloses nor suggests that feature.

The Tang et al. patent also fails to disclose or suggest that feature. The Tang et al. patent merely discloses a four terminal active matrix electroluminescent device that utilizes an organic material as the electroluminescent medium. The Tang et al. patent does not even mention recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor.

Claim 14 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 24 also was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Yamanaka patent and further in view of the Tang et al. patent.

Claim 24 depends from claim 21, which recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 14, none of the cited references discloses or suggests that feature.

Claim 24 should be allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Tang et al. patent.

Claim 16 depends from claim 2, which recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 2, Applicant's admitted prior art (FIG. 9) fails to disclose or suggest that feature. Nor does the Tang et al. patent disclose or suggest that feature.

As discussed above, the Tang et al. patent merely discloses a four terminal active matrix electroluminescent device that utilizes an organic material as the electroluminescent medium. The Tang et al. patent does not even mention recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor.

Claim 16 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 20 also was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant's alleged admitted prior art in view of the Tang et al. patent.

Claim 20 depends from claim 17, which recites a reflective display electrode that extends above a channel of a thin film transistor. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 16, none of the cited references discloses or suggests that feature.

Claim 20 should be allowable for at least that reason.

Claims 25-27 depend from claim 1, 2 or 17, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as those claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Y. Segawa et al.
Serial No. : 10/758,321
Filed : January 15, 2004
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-025002 / S21-
121248M/SW

Enclosed is a \$450 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2005



Richard P. Ferrara
Reg. No. 30,632

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291

30247293.doc